

To.

Honorable R. Allen Edgar

Case #

2:14-cv-00123-
RAED-TPG
Heath v. Perry

FILED - MQ

April 13, 2015 11:13 AM

Tracey Cordes, CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
BY: sik / scanned

①

This letter is to inform District Court that Petitioner, recieved response from respondent to Petition on 3-27-15 respondents brief is said to have 61, pages Petitioner recieved only 31, pages all even numbered pages of said brief are not contained in brief? deeming brief incomplete only option that should be made available is dismissal of respondents brief do to Failure to raise affirmative defenses. FED. R. CIV. P. 8(c) on the 31, pages that Petitioner Heath #199603 did recieve, respondent has did nothing more than rehash trial court, state appeals court, and state Supreme court. With no penetration of Petitioners Laws and Facts that support brief and Habeas corpus Petition. The reason respondent replied as it did is Petitioner has met the hurdle of high standard and above, that Federal courts requires. Petitioner therefore ask the honorable district Court to correct wrongs of constitutional dimensions. And not allow state courts or Attorney General to undermine District Court with superficial legalese with arbitrary and capricious words. Habeas corpus Petitions are a serious matter a party to petition has duty to understand what they are suppose to do, and when they are suppose to do it.

(2)

Although the practice of Personal recognizance bond is not explicitly authorized by statute or rule there is abundant authority that Federal district Judges in habeas corpus section 2255 proceedings have inherent power to admit applicants to bail pending the decision of their cases. Such power derives from the power to issue the writ itself thereby regulating governments exercise over its citizens wherefore Petitioner Prays this honorable court does just that... Do to respondents lack of argument, coupled with incomplete brief. Cite the following Fed. Authority = (Hilton v. Braunskill 9 N. Ill. U. L. Rev. 129) (Falconer v. Lane 905 F2d 1129,) (Marino v Vasquez 812 F2d 499,) (Carter v. Rafferty 781 F2d 993,) (Cherek v. U. S. 767 F2d 335) (Blair v. McCarthy 881 F2d 602,) (Thomas v. New Jersey, 472 F2d 735) (Directive 28 USC 2243)

Brother = Supportive Family members - Horace McGloster
204 Tuxedo Parkway Newark, New Jersey 07106
PH# 973-374-1142 and cell# 973-985-7892

Sister = Lillian Heath 1113 Prince S.E. Grand Rapids, MI
49507 PH# 616-262-2129

③

Both family members are
U.S. tax payers for over 60, years combined.

IF possible you can accept this as
my reply brief to respondent.

(Short and to the point)

Petitioner has demonstrated cognizable
federal court issues

that are not mixed
law or fact, there is
no need to relitigate
what has been demonstrated
as unreasonable application
of established Federal law,
decisions that are based
on unreasonable determination
of state trial judge.

Unable to evaluate state
trial court record is
not excuse enough to
violate Petitioner's
constitutional rights.

Thanking you in
advance for your
timely response.

C. C. Kept

4-6-15

Kelvin Heath #199603

Cooper Street Corr. Fac.
3100 Cooper St.
Jackson MI
49201